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The present paper deals with length vacillations, i.e. secondary shortenings and
lengthenings, in a number of Vedic formations, most of which have been disregarded by
Sanskritists thus far. It will be argued that these phenomena can be accounted for in
terms of two general tendencies.

1. -īy-/īy- in -ya-presents

To begin with, I will discuss the length vacillation in the stems of the -ya-
presents (i.e. -yā-passives and class IV presents) of the type Cṛīyā.\textsuperscript{16}

1.1. The secondary shortenings: -īy- \textrightarrow -īy-

As is well-known, the short root vowels \(\hat{i}\) and \(\hat{u}\) are lengthened before the class
IV present and passive suffix -ya- (cf. Pāṇ. 7.4.25), cf. kṣī ‘perish’ – kṣīyate / kṣīyāte, mi
‘fix, set up’ – pass. mīyā\textsuperscript{16}, śṛi ‘lay on, fix on’ – pass. -śṛīyā\textsuperscript{16} etc. However, alongside
the regular long vowel stems we find the short vowel variants. This vacillation is
particularly frequent for the passive -śṛīyā\textsuperscript{16}. The short root vowel stem -śṛīy-, only
mentioned in passing by some Sanskritists (AUFREICH, WHITNEY, LIEBICH, BÖHTLINGK,
GARBE, CALAND, BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON, GOTO)\textsuperscript{1} as an (abnormal) variant of the
regular -śṛīy-, turns out to be almost as common as the regular stem -śṛīy-. Below I
give a synopsis of forms attested in the middle and late Vedic texts, i.e. in the
Brāhmaṇas, Aranyakas and Śītras:

\textsuperscript{*} I am grateful to A. LUBOTSKY, N. NICHOLAS, Th. OBERLIES, M. DE VAAN and P. KALLIO for their
comments on the earlier drafts of this paper. I also would like to take this opportunity to express my
thanks to the audience of the XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in Halle/S.
(September 2000); particularly to Th. KRISCH and W. WINTER for their remarks.

\textsuperscript{1} -śṛīyete (AB I 29.21) is mentioned in ed. AUFREICH, p. 431 as abnormal. LIEBICH (1891: 25f., 27)
also draws attention to this “un-Pāṇini” form (in accordance with Pāṇ. 7.4.25 we expect *-śṛīyete)
and qualifies pari-śṛīyete as “eine fast in der ganzen ind. Literatur vereinzelte stehende Anomalie”,
probably representing (together with AB 4.19.2 pre-śṛīyate, for which see below) a peculiarity of the
9.11.26) is mentioned in ed. GARBE (B.Ind. 92, vol. III, Preface, p. viii) as “prakritical shortening” and
emended in CALAND’s translation (1921: 96) to “acchṛīyate”. See also WHITNEY 1885 [Roots]: 179;
In my view, the evidence for the short root vowel variant is too strong (almost half of the total amount of occurrences – at least in variant readings) to explain away forms with the short vowel as mere scribal errors. Obviously, we are confronted with the inadequacy of grammatical prescriptions (resp. descriptions) with regard to the linguistic evidence.
The stem -ṣrīyə- might be accounted for as emerging under the influence of the -ya-presents built on Cṛ roots, such as mriyə- "die", hṛiyə- "be brought", etc.² Given the phonological similarity of the -ya-stems built on Cṛ and Cṛ roots (Cr̥ya- / Cṛya-), one might expect that these two morphological types would mutually influence each other and could be partly confused. Thus, we find the irregular Cr̥ya- stems built on Cṛ roots (e.g. dhṛiyate and hṛiyate from dhṛ and hṛ; for details, see below, Section 1.2), particularly, from the late Vedic period onwards. In other words, forms derived from the stem -ṣrīya- could be regarded as built on the secondary root variant śṛ. There are indeed some rare forms which can only be derived from śṛ, but they are clearly late and isolated.

Besides the stem -ṣrīyə-, the length vacillation occurs in two more stems with similar phonological structures (Cr̥ya-), namely in AB 4.19.2 pra-vliyan (Voll 'collapse')⁴ and in the present priyə- (sṛṣṭi 'please') – mostly in imperative forms priyataṃ and priyantar-i 'let him/them be pleased', attested in a few late mantras⁵ (alongside the expected priyatām and priyantar).⁶ Obviously, the short root vowel in -vliyan cannot be (directly) explained by the influence of the type mriyāē / hṛiyāē. Furthermore, assuming that the shortening of i in Cr̥ya- (and lengthening of i in mriyāē / hṛiyāē) is merely due to the confusion of these two morphological types, one might expect a random character for the length vacillation. This is not the case, however. As it turns out, there are two conditions which are relevant for the vowel length:

(i) We find short vowel variants before the long suffix vowel. In particular, two of the forms built on the stem -ṣrīya- have the vowel e in the suffix (aḍhī-ṣrīyeta Kaṭāhā.

---

² For this morphological type and its genesis, see KULIKOV 1997.
³ Cf. the absolute adhīrīyə (instead of the correct adhirīyə) in KauŚ 2.31 viśnupātām ājñasya gṛhyāvādīrāyə... 'having taken some melted clarified butter [and then] having put it [on the fire]...'; part pf pass. saccacya- attested in VaiŚ 10.19 as a variant reading (in one ms.; another ms. [C] has the correct reading ucchrita-; see ed. GARBE, crit.app., p. 64).
⁴ The form is mentioned by WHITNEY (1885 [Roots]: 168) and LIEBICH (1891: 27).
⁵ In particular, in the following mantras:
(SGS 4.4.12 = BaudhGS 1.1.24 = BhrārGS 3.16:85.5 = VaikīGS 6.2.90:21-91.1 = VaikṛŚS 1.4:5.13-14 = JGS 1.6.16 = ĀgnīGS 2.3.2:56.9)

nāṇadūkādāḥ pitarāḥ priyantar-i 'Let the fathers, with joyful faces [a particular class of ancestors], be pleased' (the short vowel variant is attested in four Taittīrīya Śūtras: VaikīŚS, VaikīGS, BaudhGS, BhrārGS);
(VaikīGS 1.6.16 = ĀgnīGS 2.3.4:58.1)

praṇijārṣiḥ priyantar-i 'Let Praṇjāpita be pleased'

(as in the preceding example, the long vowel variant is attested in the ĀgnīGS, in contrast to other Śūtras of the Taittīrīya school – an editorial conjecture of the non-critical edition by RAVI VARMA?);
(MāŚS 11.9.2.5)

priyantar-i pitarāḥ; priyantar-pitāmahāḥ; priyantar-prapitāmahāḥ

'Let the fathers be pleased; let the grandfathers be pleased, the great-grandfathers be pleased'

The ms. have short vowels in all the three occurrences, which ed. VAN GELDER emends to 'priyə'.

In addition, one might mention BaudhŚS 23.8:16.16 (ms.) abhyunyōra, abhyapanyēra (Snī 'lead'); which may represent 'abhyyunīyēran or 'abhyapanyēran, ed. CALAND reads 'abhyunīyēran.
pari-śriyete AB); the only attestation of the stem variant -vliy[a]- (pra-vliyeraṇ AB) displays the same feature. On the other hand, we find not a single form with following \( e \) or \( a \) among the occurrences of the regular long vowel stem -śrīy[a]-.

(ii) All the short root vowel forms (except for the late priyantām) are compounds with preverbs. While the passive -śrīyāḥ does not occur without preverbs (at least in Vedic prose; see KULIKOV 2001: 202ff.), the present vliyāḥ, well-attested as a simplex in Vedic prose, never displays the short vowel variant in simplicia.

1.2. The secondary lengthenings: -iṃ → -īṃ-

Indirect evidence for the significance of these two parameters is furnished by the cases of the secondary lengthening in the -ya-stems built on ġṛ roots, such as ġṛ ‘make’, dhṛ ‘stay’, bhṛ ‘carry’, ṛṛ (vṛ) ‘choose’, hrṛ ‘bring’. Below I give a list of such forms (which by no means claims to be exhaustive):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ṛṛ} & \quad \text{hrīyamāṇā-} & \quad \text{AVP 19.3.1 (Kasm.)} \\
\text{ṛṛ} & \quad \text{dhrīyate} & \quad \text{GB 1.1.2.2.6 (v.l. [mss. A, B])} \\
[\text{ḥṛṛ}] & \quad \text{dhrīyamāṇa-} & \quad \text{GB 1.2.20:56.3 (v.l., also dhrīyamāṇa-; recte bhrīyamāṇa-)} \\
\text{ḥṛṛ} & \quad \text{bhrīyamāṇa-} & \quad \text{AVP 4.14.7 (Kashm., Or., v.l. [ms. Vā.]) (ed. BHATTACHARYA bhrīyamāṇa-)} \\
\text{vṛ (vṛ)} & \quad \text{pra-vṛīyamāṇe} & \quad \text{GB 1.5.21:134.4 (v.l.), BaudhŚŚ 3.18:89.14 (v.l. [ms. B])} \\
\text{ḥṛṛ} & \quad \text{hrīyamāṇa-} & \quad \text{AVŚ 12.5.29 (v.l.; other v.l. ṛṛṛ, ṛṛṛ)} \\
\text{ḥṛṛ} & \quad \text{hrīyamāṇa-} & \quad \text{KB 9.5. ed. ĀnŚŚ, ed. BHATTACHARYA (ed. LINDNER, ed. SARMA 9.5.15) hṛṛa);} \\
& & \quad \text{GB 1.2.9:41.13 (all mss. in ed. GAASTRA; ed. MITRA [1.2.8] also v.l. ṛṛṛa), 1.3.11:77.1 (v.l.), 1.3.11:77.11 (v.l.), 1.3.12:78.13 (v.l.), 1.3.12:79.4 (v.l.) [consistently in mss. A. and E.];} \\
& & \quad \text{KausŚŚ 71.12;} \\
& & \quad \text{DrāvyŚŚ 14.3.15 (hrīyamāṇāyām, v.ll. sāṣṭhṛīṛa, sāṣṭhrīṛa), 15.1.13 (v.l.)} \\
\text{ḥṛṛīyamāṇa-, abhi-hṛṛī} & \quad \text{APrāyaśc. 3.2 (v.l.)} \\
\text{ā-hṛṛīyamāṇa-} & \quad \text{MānŚŚ 7.2.7.21, JŚŚ 1.24.14 [ed. GAASTRA 23:30.4] (v.l. [ms. B2])}^{7} \\
\text{ud-hṛṛīyamāṇa-} & \quad \text{AVŚ 12.5.34 (v.l.)} \\
\text{ud-hṛṛīyamāṇa-} & \quad \text{JŚŚ 1.23.7 [ed. GAASTRA 22:28.5] (v.l. [mss. B2, B3, B4])} \\
\text{udhṛīyamāṇa-} & \quad \text{BhāṛŚŚ 6.7.6 (v.l., also udhṛīyamāṇa-, recte ud-dhrīyamāṇa-)}
\end{align*}
\]

---

7 I would like to take this opportunity to thank A. PARPOLA for providing me with a preliminary version of his edition of JŚŚ (vol. I).
Most importantly, in contrast to the forms with the secondary short root vowel, the above list contains a number of simplex forms and no form with a long suffix vowel ($e$, $ā$).

Even more instructive is the ‘negative’ evidence provided by the GB: some mss. (above all, A and B in ed. GAASTRA’s critical apparatus) consistently substitute $i$ for $i$ in 

\textit{hariya-} and \textit{dhiya-} (see above), but all mss. unanimously read \textit{dhriyeta} (not **\textit{dhiyeta})

at 1.1.34:27.9.

To sum up, there are two independent parameters which preclude the lengthening of the root vowel $i$ before the suffix -\textit{ya}: the vowel length of the following syllable and the presence of a preverb. It turns out that the scope of these two conditions is not limited to the -\textit{ya}-presents. Below I will discuss further evidence for these phenomena.

2. Shortening after preverbs / lengthening in the simplex before -\textit{y}-

While the influence of the length of the following vowel has never been noticed by grammarians, the shortening of the root vowel after preverbs before some suffixes beginning with -\textit{y}- (in particular, in -\textit{yā}-passives, absolutives, precatives) is prescribed by Pāṇini (7.4.23-24) for two roots with vocalic anlaut; see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1896 [AI G I]: 92; DEBRUNNER 1957 [Nachtr. zu AI G I]: 54; RENOU 1930: 70, §63; NARTEN 1982: 131 [= Kl. Schr. 1, 257]. Pāṇini’s sūtra 7.4.23 requires the shortening of the long $ā$ in some derivatives of the root $ūh$ ‘shift, transpose’ (attested, for instance, in the passive \textit{vṛ-uhyā.} MS, SB). The next sūtra precludes the lengthening of $i$ in the root present optatives of $i$ ‘go’ (prescribed by Pāṇi, 7.4.25 for the simplex: \textit{ṝyār} etc.). The actual state of affairs is somewhat more complicated, however: we find indeed only the short vowel after preverbs$^{10}$ in Vedic texts$^{11}$ but both variants in the simplex (3pl. \textit{ṝyār / iyār etc.}).$^{12}$

---

8 Apud ed. PARPOA, not recorded in ed. GAASTRA.
9 For this passive and its confusion with the passive of the etymologically related root \textit{vah} ‘carry’ in late texts, see KUKIKOV 2001: 181ff.
10 Cf. even the irregular short $i$ in \textit{pariyāf[i]} in mss. (against the sandhi $i + i → i$), recorded by CALAND (1904: 200 [= Kl. Schr. 161], with fn. 6), for which he emends \textit{pariyāf[i].}
11 But cf. \textit{-yār} (built on the secondary root $i$; see OBERLIES 2003: 139, 208f., 392f.) in the Mūl. I would like to thank Th. OBERLIES for having drawn my attention to this Epic form.
12 See RENOU 1930: 65 and his 1960’s Addenda ad loc.; DEBRUNNER 1957 [Nachtr. zu AI G I]: 28 (with bibl.); for the full evidence, see GOTO 1990: 994f., with fn. 35.
Incidentally, this rule might also explain the fact that -śrī́yā- is more frequently attested with the short root vowel than other -ya-presents of the same structure (C/Rṣyā-): as said above, this passive is employed only with preverbs, so that there may have been a weak tendency to generalize the short root vowel irrespectively of the length of the suffix vowel.

3. -i/-i- vacillation in nominal stems

3.1. Derivatives of ṭṛ (pṛ)

The tendency outlined above (-i- before long vowels, -i- before short vowels) nicely accounts for the vowel length in the four nominal derivatives of the root ṛṇi (pṛ) ‘blame, scorn’ (pres. pṛya-), which otherwise can hardly be explained:

pṛya- ‘scornful’ RV 1.174.8 = 2.19.7 (also in deha-pṛyi- AV, VS, ŚB);
pṛya- id. AV 16.6.8;
pṛyatni- id. RV 8.2.15; 13
pṛyāru- id. RV, AV. 14

3.2. Nominal stems in ‘CRṣyā-

There is a class of nominal (adjectival) stems where the i/i-vacillation is particularly common and, at first glance, totally random. These are a few stems with the suffix -ṣyā- (-ṣyā-), 15 most of which are listed and briefly discussed by Wackernagel/Debrunner (1954 [AI 2]: 441f., §268d); according to Wackernagel/Debrunner, the long vowel variants are recent and secondary:

āgrīya- / āgrīya- ‘chief, foremost’;
apaṇapṛṣṭya- / apaṇapṛṣṭya- and apaṇapṛṣṭya- / apaṇapṛṣṭya- ‘relating to the grandson of the waters (= Agni)’;
asīya- / asīya- ‘relating to horses’ (cf. also RV 4.17.11 asīyā (neutr.pl.) ‘troops of horses’);
pāṭrya- / pāṭrya- ‘relating to / suitable for a (sacrificial) vessel’, also in yajñapāṭrya-;

---

13 Debrunner (1954 [AI 2]: 170, §73), and subsequently Hoffmann (1957 [= Asfis 2, 411]), consider pṛyatni- as a -ni-derivative based on the participle pṛyat- ("nach dem Muster von kṛt-ni-‘tätig’.

14 See Debrunner 1954 [AI 2]: 288, §77a.

15 Along with the short and long vowel variants, some of these stems are also attested with the monosyllabic variant of the suffix, i.e. -ya- (-yā-): sthṛtya- etc. For the (partly related) problems of the representation of the early Vedic group Čv (Cṛṣyā) in later texts and the middle/late Vedic anaptyxis of the type satyā → sathavya, see, in particular, Witze 1989: 173ff.
puṭriya- / puṭrīya- ‘relating to a son’, also in apuṭriya- ‘relating to the absence of sons’;

mahendriya- / mahendrīya- ‘relating / belonging to the great Indra’;

yajñiya- / yajñīya- ‘worthy of sacrifice’, also in yajñāyajñīya- / yajñāyajñīya-.

the name of the last laud (stotra) of the evening Soma pressing, ayajñīya- ‘not fit for sacrifice, profane’;

rāṣtriya- / rāṣṭrīya- ‘relating to a kingdom’, also in anyarāṣṭrīya- ‘belonging to another kingdom’;

rāṣtriya- / rāṣṭrīya- (in śatarāṣṭrīya- / śatarāṣṭrīya-, a particular oblation to Rudra and the corresponding litany, lit. ‘relating to hundred Rudras’);

sat(i)ترا- / sat(i)ترا- ‘relating to the sattra sacrifice’;

sahasraiya- / sahasrīya- ‘(giving) thousandfold’;

stotriya- / stotriya- ‘relating to a stotra’; stotriyā- (fem.), a stotra verse, also in astotriya- ‘not having stotra verse’, asvastotriya- ‘not having its own stotra verse’.

ukhāyastotriya- ‘the verse of the uktha-stotra’. prṣṭhastotriya- (var. prṣṭhṛya) ‘relating to prṣṭhastotra (a particular form of singing in the Soma ritual)’;

hotriya- / hotriya- (in cāṭuḥhotriya- ‘attended by four chief priests’).

First let it be noted that in all of these stems the length vacillation occurs in the same phonological context as in the passive -ṣṭṝyā-, i.e. after a consonant + sonant (mostly r) before -y[ṛ]ṇa- – which can hardly be accidental.

Apparently, in most cases, the paradigmatic pressure has levelled the vowel length, so that we find no traces of the vacillation within one text. Thus, for instance, the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras of the Rgveda (AB, KB, AśŚŚ, ŚŚŚ, ŚGS) and Atharvaveda (GB, VaitŚ) as well as the texts of the White Yajurveda (VS, SB, KātyŚŚ) have generalized stotriya-. On the contrary, the texts of the Taittirīya school (TS, TB, ĀpŚŚ, BaudhŚŚ, VaikhŚŚ) and the PB (with the corresponding Śrauta-Sūtras: LāṭyŚŚ and DārśyŚŚ) attest the long vowel stem stotrīya-. Of the two closely related Śrauta-Sūtras of the Sāmadeva, Lāṭyāyana and Dārśyāyana, the former has yajñīya- and ayajñīya- (e.g. at 2.6.1, 3.12.2, 4.11.6), while the latter has introduced the long vowel: yajñīya- and ayajñīya- (5.2.1, 10.4.2, 12.3.3 etc.; ayajñīya- also occurs in DārśyGS 1.1.25); see RENOU 1947: 104. For the sake of convenience, I summarize the distribution of the attested variants in Vedic texts / schools in the below table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stems</th>
<th>-ι-β</th>
<th>-ι-β</th>
<th>-ι-β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀγρίγα-</td>
<td>TS 4.5.5.2; TB, PB, SB, Ἁᾶς, BaudhSS, BaudhGS, VaikGS, KauS</td>
<td>MS 2.9.5;124.13.16, 2.7.13.94.18.17; Pαn. 4.4.11.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποναπτριξα-</td>
<td>JB, ΚάτυS, SSS</td>
<td>TS, MS; AB, PB, Ἁᾶς, Ἁᾶς, BaudhSs, MāṇSS, DrāhySS, LātySS, VaitS</td>
<td>KB 2.3 (ed. SARMA [2.4.16])², Pαn. 4.2.27-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγίνναπτριξα-</td>
<td>KSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σατιγα-</td>
<td>TS 2.2.12.8</td>
<td>Παn. 4.2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάτριγα-</td>
<td>TS, Pαn. 5.1.88</td>
<td>MS 19, SB 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατριγα-</td>
<td>VādhS, KāthGS, SGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>SVB 2.8.1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>महेंद्रिगा-</td>
<td>KSS, KPŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yajñiγα-</td>
<td>RV, TS, MS 24, KS; mos Br. and Śr.</td>
<td>DrāhySS, DrāhyGS²⁵</td>
<td>KPS²⁶, JB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yajñāyāγiγα-</td>
<td>MS²⁷, KPŚ; SB, TB; Taitṛīya Srū.; Ἁᾶς, HīśS, VaikGS, KātyS, KauS</td>
<td>KS; AB, PB, JB, AA, SVB, CHU²⁸; Ἁᾶς, LātySS, DrāhySS, KāthGS</td>
<td>KB²⁹, SSS²⁰; BaudhSS 10.1.5; 14.1.7³¹, MāṇSS 1.5.1.5.1²²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ῥάγριγα-</td>
<td>Pαn. 4.2.93</td>
<td>SB³³, MāṇSS 5.1.7.48</td>
<td>MS³⁴, KS³⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16 MS²⁴ ἀγρίγα (Pp. ἀγρίγα) ~ TS²⁴ 4.5.5.2 ἀγρίγα ~ VS 16.30 ἀγρίγα.
17 ἀγριγα, v.l. ἰγαμ, ἰγαμ.
18 Ed. LINDER, ed. AnśSS aponaptrixasa, ed. SARMA ἰγαμα.
19 MS 3.8.5.101.14 πατριγα; 4.5.5.79.12 πατριγα, v.l. ἰγαμ; 4.5.9.77.16 yajñapātrikā.
20 SBM 2.2.4.10 yajñapātrikā ~ ŚBK 1.2.4.7 ῥάγρα- (thus ed. SWAMINATHAN), v.l. ἰγαμ- (thus in ed. CALAND); see ed. CALAND, Preface, p. 50.
21 Also πατριγα.
22 Ed. BURNELL putrīvānām, ed. SHARMA and comm. ἰγαμα.
23 Also māhendra-
24 But MS 1.6.4.93.2 [ιγα]γα [ιγο], v.l. ἰγο [ms. M2].
25 DrāhyGS 1.1.25 ἰγαγιγαμ.
26 The ἰ-γα-stem occurs from Chapter 39 onwards; see below.
27 But MS 1.6.7.98.10 yajñāyāγιγα, v.l. ἰγαμ [ms. M2].
28 CHU 2.19.1.2 yajñāyāγιγα.
30 Variant readings in nss. (ed. HILLEBRANDT consistently -ί-), e.g. in ἰγαμ 6.3.8, 8.6.1 yajñāyāγιγα, v.l. ἰγαμ; 8.6.5 yajñāyāγιγα, v.l. ἰγαμ; etc.; see ed. HILLEBRANDT, crit. app., p. 251, 254 etc.
31 yajñāyāγιγα, v.l. ἰγαμ.
32 yajñāyāγιγα (thus in ed.), v.l. ἰγαμ.
33 SBM 5.3.4.9 ~ SŚK 7.2.27 anvarāγριγα.
34 MS 3.3.7.40.7 rāγριγα; 3.1.12.13.18, 14.4 rāγριγα.
35 KS 37.11.92.16 rāγριγα, v.l. ἰγαμ; 37.11.92.2 rāγριγα.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stems</th>
<th>-iṣ-</th>
<th>-iṣ-</th>
<th>-iṣ-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| rudrīya-  | YV except Taïtirīya:36  
            | MS, KS, KpS, VS; ŚB,  
            | Kāth-Saṃk.; MānŚŚ,  
            | VārŚŚ, KātyŚŚ, BaudhŚŚ,  
            | VāsDhŚ | Taïtirīya: TS; ĀpŚŚ,  
            | BaudhŚŚ, VaikhŚŚ,  
            | HīrŚŚ | TB;  
            | VispuSmṛ. 56.2137,  
            | KaivalyaU 2.538,  
            | Vārṭtika 2 on Pāṇ. 4.2.28 |
| sattrīya- | KS, KpS; AB, TB, TĀ,  
            | PB, JB, BaudhŚŚ,  
            | ĀgnivGŚ | ĀpŚŚ 14.7.22 = HīrŚŚ  
            | 9.8.46⁴⁰  |
| sahasrīya-| RV, AVP 1.39.2⁴¹, TS,  
            | KS, KpS, VS; TB, ŚB,  
            | Pāṇ. 4.4.135 | MS⁴ ⁴²  |
| stotrīya- | RV school: AŚ, KB;  
            | AŚŚ, ŚŚŚ, ŚGS;  
            | AV school: GB, VaiśŚŚ;  
            | White YV: VS, ŚB,  
            | KātyŚŚ | Taïtirīya: TS, TB;  
            | ĀpŚŚ, BaudhŚŚ,  
            | VaikhŚŚ;  
            | PB⁴²; LātyŚŚ,  
            | DrāhyŚŚ, NīdānaŚ⁴⁴ | JB |
| Ṛhotrīya-| TĀ 1.22.1 = 1.26.2  
            | | | ĀgnivGŚ, BaudhGŚ|

Apparently, the treatment of the sequence -CRī- is not quite consistent for some texts of the first two groups (-iṣ-,-iṣ-). Thus, the MS (together with the corresponding Śrauta-Sūtra, MānŚŚ) usually has the long suffix vowel in āgriṣa-, aponaprīṣa-, rāṣṭrīṣa- and sahasrīṣa-, while the Taïtirīya school has āgriṣa- and sahasrīṣa-⁴⁵ (but aponaprīṣa-). However, for rudrīṣa- the distribution is the opposite (MS rudrīṣa-, TS rudeṣṭa-), and in stotrīṣa- the Taïtirīya school has generalized the long vowel as well. Some texts of the third group (iṣ-) indiscriminately use two or even three variants, sometimes with variant readings in the different manuscripts; for instance, the JB has stotrīṣa-, stotṛyā- and stotṛyā-.⁴⁶ The MS almost exclusively has the short vowel in (a)jāṣiṣa- and yāṣṭiṣa-ḥya-; but one of the mss., SCHROEDER'S M2, which reaches only up to Chapter

---

36 But BaudhPS -iṣ-.
37 rudrīya in both eds. (ed. JOLLY, ed. KRISHNAMACHARYA), v.l. (in ed. KRISHNAMACHARYA) rudrīya.
38 Ed. "108 Up." -iṣ-, ed. ĀnŚŚ 29 ("32 Up.") -iṣ-, v.l. -iṣ-.
39 Both the geminate (sattrīṣa-) and non-geminate (sattrīṣa-) variants are well-attested. The distribution is roughy as follows: -iṣ- occurs in the KS and KpS. -iṣ- appears in the AB, TB, TĀ, PB, JB; BaudhŚŚ 10.25.34.8 has sattrīṣa, with v.l. sattrīṣa.
40 ĀpŚŚ sattrīṣ[a] = HīrŚŚ sattrīṣ[a].
41 Or. mss. sahasrīṣa.
43 But with the short root vowel in stotṛyāsamṛṣpa- (see below).
44 In uṣṭiṣyajantṛiṣa-.
45 See BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1912 [Ved. Var. II], 258, §541.
46 Cf. e.g. JĀ 2.11.9 stotṛyā, v.l. stotṛyāḥ, stotṛyā, 2.238.6 stotṛyā, v.l. stotṛyāḥ, 2.330.4 stotṛyāḥ, v.l. stotṛyāḥ, 2.321.4 stotṛyāḥ, v.l. stotṛyāḥ.
1.8.9, clearly prefers -ị-, as noticed already by SCHROEDER in his edition (vol. I. Einleitung, p. xxv). In the KPS both (a)yājñīya- and (a)jñīṣṭha- are well-attested, but the distribution of the variants in the text is not totally random. The short vowel variant occurs in the first half of the text: 1.16:12.14, 6.5:63.7 (-īyā), 1.17:13.7 (-īyā), 7.5:76.2 (-īyās), 28.1:121.22 (-īyō[ḥ], -īyānām). From Chapter 39 onwards, the long vowel variant becomes more frequent\(^47\) which may point to the work of a different copyist (cf. also the irregular 3p. ending - anus (instead of - an) before -ī-, which appears in sections 37.8-44.9; see ed. RAGHu VrIa, Introduction, p. 5f). The -ī- variant is consistently employed in Chapters 39 and 40 (and sporadically appears in some other Chapters: 39.1:213.2, 39.3:214.18 and 39.4:215.23 ayañīya, 39.2:213.8 yajñīya, 39.4:216.12 yajñīyah, 39.4:216.13 yajñīyas, 40.1:220.1, 46.2:223.11, 47.6:289.5 yajñīye); the -ī- variant re-appears from Chapter 41 onwards (41.6:242.11 yajñīya, 41.6:242.15, 47.9:293.2 yajñīva, 47.8:291.21 ayañīya, 47.8:292.21 yajñīyan). There are, however, a few cases – which are of particular interest for our discussion – where we are probably confronted with a nonrandom distribution of the variants:

(i) The stem yajñīya- occurs in ed. RAGHu VrIa/Lokesh Chandra with both short and, more rarely, long vowels, cf. JB 2.63:2 yajñīya ~ JB 2.245:5 yajñīya, \(^48\) 3.38:12 yajñīya (thus in ed.). In general, the text seems to have generalized the variant yajñīya-, whilst yajñīya- is found only in bad mss. (G. EHLERS, p.c.).\(^48\) Yet, taking the full mss. evidence into account, we can formulate the following (weak) regularity with respect to the distribution of i and ï: we find ï before long vowels, whereas both i and ï may appear before short vowels. The full evidence is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i before long vowels</th>
<th>ï (?) before short vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yajñīya</td>
<td>yajñīya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.245:6 = 1.246:5</td>
<td>2.63:2 (thus mss., ed. ï)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.246:8</td>
<td>yajñīya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.245:5 (ed. ï)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yajñīyām</td>
<td>yajñīvya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.256:1</td>
<td>2.401:5-6 (ï in ms. Ka; ed. ï)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.38:12 (ï in mss. Ka, Ga = Bur; other mss. ï)(^49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yajñīvaya</td>
<td>yajñīvaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.164:9 = 3.301:8</td>
<td>3.391:8 (ed. ï)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yajñīvaya</td>
<td>3.303:15 (ï in ms. Bur and ed.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^47\) Ed. RAGHu VrIa emends everywhere to -ī-.
\(^48\) I would like to take this opportunity to thank G. EHLERS for providing me with a preliminary version of A. Murakawa’s edition of the Gīvāmayaṇa-Section of the JB (2.1-50, 2.37:1-442) and for discussing with me the JB evidence.
\(^49\) This occurrence appears in the repetition of RV 1.6.4c = SV 2.201c [= 2.2.2.7.2c] dāśāṃ bana yajñīya ‘having made for themselves a name worthy of sacrifice’.
(ii) More scant is the evidence in the case of the three attestations of the compound šatarudriya- in the TB. The distribution of the short and long vowel variants follows our rule: šatarudriyañām (3.6.11.2), šatarudriyām (3.11.10.3), šatarudriyāsya (3.11.9.1). However, while šatarudriya- (3.11.10.3, 3.11.9.1) exhibits the standard meaning of this ritual term (a particular oblation to Rudra and the corresponding litany), the context of the only attestation of the -y-stem (ghāstāṁ nānām ... šatarudriyañām) is obscure. DuMONT (1962: 259) hesitatingly translates the passage as ‘Let them both now eat of these [offerings] ... as strong as one hundred Rudras’ (with a question mark, cf. also fn. 61); in any case, in the TB, the meaning of šatarudriya- seems to be different from that of šatarudriya-. It cannot be ruled out that the redactors of this text distinguished the two meanings of this word depending on the suffix vowel length.

(iii) The PB has generalized the long vowel in stotriya- (cf. 14.1.7 stotriyāh, 5.6.4 stotriyā (4x) etc.), probably on the model of the forms with the short vowel after -īy-. However, in the compound stotriyāmārīpa-, a technical term denoting a particular verse and the corresponding reply (PB 11.6.6 etc.), where iy is always followed by a long vowel, the short i could be due to the long vowel of the next syllable.

4. Some related phenomena in -ya-presents before long suffix vowels

Below I will briefly discuss a few irregularities attested in the stems of the -ya-presents which do not belong to the type Cṛya- but seem to have also been triggered by the length of the suffix vowel.

4.1. Irregular duals and subjunctives; indicatives for subjunctives

4.1.1. tujete for “tujyete (RV)

Alongside two occurrences of the passive tujya-“be terrified, put to panic flight [by Indra]’ (both in mandala I of the RV), we find in precisely the same usage (see Renou 1958: 64f.; Kulikov 2001: 82) the dual form tujete, cf. (i):

(1) (RV 1.6.1.14ab)

asyēd u bhityā girāyai ca dhāhā’ dyāvā ca bhāmā januṣas tujete

Because of the fear of his (sc. Indra’s) birth, both firm mountains and heaven and earth are set to panic motion.”

From the formal point of view, this form could only be a class VI present. However, the passive usage is extremely unusual for class VI presents and, furthermore, the present tuja- is unattested with middle inflexion elsewhere. In my view, the form tujete can be explained phonologically, as a replacement of the original *tujyete. The loss of y (and thus the lightening of the root syllable) before e may betray the same tendency, i.e. to “lighten” the root syllable before long vowels.
4.1.2. -śīṣātai for *-śīgyātai (AV)

The same explanation is appropriate for the abnormal subjunctive ucchīṣātai in

(2): (AVŚ 2.31.3cd)

śiṣān āśiṣṭān ni tirāmi vācā 'yāhā kramīṇāṁ nākir ucchīṣātai

‘Those [worms], left [or] not left [i.e. remaining – L.K.], I draw down by my
spell, that no one of the worms be left.’ (WHITNEY)

The form ‘śīṣātai is morphologically impossible, since neither class VI presents nor
thematic aorists are derived from this root (note also the impossible root accentuation);
besides, middle subjunctives of thematic aorists are practically unknown in Vedic. In
accordance with the intransitive syntax of the pāda, one might expect a -ya-present;
WHITNEY (1905: 1, 74) conjectured ‘ucchisyātai’.50 Again, the loss of y may be due to
the long suffix vowel.

4.1.3. Irregular forms in Vedic prose

Forms with the secondary loss of y before the long suffix vowel in the
subjunctive are found in the KS and KpS, too. Most instructive is the following YVś
passage, to which SCHROEDER (1896: 6) has drawn attention:

(3) (KS 27.3:141.20-142.1, 4-5 = KpS 42.3:250.5-6, 10-11 ~ TS 6.4.7.1-2)

vāryaṇaṃ vṛṇai madagrā ēva grahaḥ 

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{[TS]} & \text{ grhyāntā} \\
\text{[KS]} & \text{ grhāntā} \\
\text{[KpS]} & \text{ grhyantarā} \\
\end{align*} \]

iti.

tasmād vāyvagrā graḥa grahyante <…>

vāryaṇaṃ vṛṇai maddevaṭyāṇy ēva pāṭrāṇy 

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{[TS]} & \text{ ucyānā} \\
\text{[KS]} & \text{ ucyantā} \\
\text{[KpS]} & \text{ ucyantarā}^{51} \\
\end{align*} \]

iti

‘“I will choose the wealth; verily, [your] cups will be drawn starting with mine”.
Therefore the cups are drawn starting with those for Vāyu. <…> “I will choose
the wealth; verily, [your] cups will be called having me as their deity”.’

The forms shown in the bold case (grhāntā, grhyantarā, ucyantarā) are ungrammatical;
SCHROEDER emends to ‘grhyāntā iti and ucyantarā iti for the KS. Apparently, in the case
of subj. grhyantarā, the KS and KpS have followed two distinct (and, in a sense.

---

50 For the accentuation of this form, see KULKOV 1998: 2001: 325, 533-537, 554.
51 According to SCHROEDER (1896: 6), the KpS ms. reads … pāṭrāṇy ucyantarā iti; ed. RAGHU VIRA
does not mention this reading in his crit. app.
symmetrical) ways to solve the prosodic conflict between the long (closed) root syllable and long suffix vowel: the Kāṭhaka "lightens" the root syllable by dropping the y, the KpS shortens the suffix vowel (see also REJNOU 1933: 90).

Also worthy of mention is the YVic passage (4) noticed by REJNOU (1937: 35):

(4) (TS 5.2.10.3 ~ KS 20.9.28.9-10 ~ KpS 31.11:158.21-22)

śadāṁ tā trāhmanām vājeyāṁ [Tel, Ks in v.l.] upadhiyānāi [KS, KpS] upadhiyānta iti

'The one for whom these [bricks] shall be put down shall eat brahmaūna-food.'

The TS has the expected subjunctive upadhiyānti (attested also in the Ks in variant readings upadhiyāntī and upadhiyāntā). The indicative form, by contrast, is attested in the KS–KpS, and must be secondary.53

Cf. also coordinated subjunctive and indicative forms in (5):

(5) (ŚB 14.9.1.2 = BĀUM 6.1.2)

vēthā vāthämāḥ prajāḥ prayāyō vāpraipādyāntāsī iti <...> vēthā vāthāśī lokā evān bakābhīn pūrṇaḥ-punah prayādbhiṁ nā sāmpūryāśī itā54

"Do you know, how these beings on passing away separate in different directions?" <...> "Do you know, how yonder world does not overfill with the many [beings] who continually pass away?",

Yet another YVic example of an abnormal passive with a secondarily shortened suffix vowel is the form viğhāyate, attested in KpS 4.1:37.3 and KS 6.2:50.11 (as a variant reading) for the correct vi̞-jñayate (thus emended in ed. RAGHU VIRA in accordance with the Kāṭhaka reading).

4.1.4. The sporadic loss of y- in late Vedic and post-Vedic optatives

Finally, the tendency to "lighten" the root syllable before the long suffix vowel (e) may be responsible for the rise of the irregular third person optative forms built on some present stems in -y, such as -aset, -set, naset, -nacya instead of -asety, -sety, nasety, nacyet (roots as "throw", sā 'bind', naś 'perish', nāḥ 'tie'),56 Forms without y- are attested from the Sūtras onwards. We find, for instance (the below list does not claim to be exhaustive):

52 V.l. 'yanta in the KS.
53 Cf. KEITH (1914: 415, fn. 1): "the subj. in TS. is obviously better than the indic. of KS."
54 Ed. BÖHLEINCCH 'ṣampūryāśīti.
55 Note that in all these forms -y- is dropped after a sibilant.
56 For -aset, see, in particular, BÖHLEINCCH 1896: 249f.; M. LEUMANN 1968: 58. For the attestations of -aset in the Dharma-Sūtras, see BHARADWAJ 1982: 101; for Epic forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 197, with fn. 2, 3
\textit{āhy-aset} LātyŚŚ 7.5.18, ĀpDhŚ 1.27.8 (\textsc{-HirDhŚ 1.7.33 abhy-asyet})\textsuperscript{57},

\textit{VāśDhŚ 25.4 = BaudhDhŚ 4.1.2, VāśDhŚ 25.10, ParāśSmṛ. 2.5, MaitrU 6.23},
late Up.

\textit{ny-aset} Kāṭh-Saṅk. (ed. SŪRYAKANTA, p. 141, 1. 16), HirŚŚ 22.2.26

(\textsc{-ĀpŚŚ 19.19.3 ny-asyet}, MānŚŚ 10.5.5.22, 11.7.1.6\textsuperscript{58}, VaikhGS.

ĀgniGS, ViṣṇuSmṛ., ManuSmṛ. 6.46, VājŚŚmr. 2.303., 3.35, ParāśSmṛ.,

BhāgP 7.12.24\textsuperscript{58}, late Up.

\textit{vi-ny-aset} MānŚŚ 11.7.1.6, ManuSmṛ. 3.226, ParāśSmṛ. 5.16, 5.17,

AVPariŚ., late Up.

\textit{san-ny-aset} ĀgniGS, BaudhPS 2.4.7.1 (thus in nus., ed. RAABE emends to ‘\textit{ny-asyet}), VāśDhŚ 10.4.3\textsuperscript{8}, (V.l. \textit{san-tyajet}), ManuSmṛ. 6.94

\textit{nir-aset} ĀśŚŚ 1.3.31

\textit{vānai} naśet Mbb.

\textit{vi-pra-naśet} Mbb.

\textit{vi-jaśet} BhāgP 4.14.16\textsuperscript{59}, Mbb.

\textit{vānah} pari-nahet Mbb. 1.26.19

\textit{vāsā} abhy-ava-set BaudhŚŚ 21.11:88.18-19, KauŚŚ 137.1

\textit{vā-ava-set} MānŚŚ 5.2.8.20, Mbb.

The morphological analysis of these forms is unclear. The form \textit{-set} is hesitantly qualified by WHITNEY (1885 [Roots]: 185) as a class I present formation, but the derivation of a class I present from an a root \{asts\} is impossible, and thus \textit{-set} cannot represent anything but an optative of \textit{-stvī} (i.e., \textit{-syet}). In the case of the \textit{-ya-present āśya-\textsuperscript{4}}, we find a few instances of non-optative forms without \textit{y} in late texts (e.g., ManuSmṛ., Mbb. 3sg.med. \textit{abhāyasate}, late Up. 3sg.act. \textit{sam-ny-asatī}; Mbb. 1sg.act. naiṁī, vy-ava-sāṁī, 3pl.act. vy-ava-santī, etc.; see BÖHTLINGK 1896: 249f.; M. LEUMANN 1968: 58; OBERLIES 2003: 197, 390, 458, 531), but the obvious preponderance of optative forms among attestations of this secondary class I present clearly shows that the starting point for the rise of the present \textit{asa-\textsuperscript{10}} was the 3sg.opt.

\textit{4.2. Forms with long suffix vowels and gaps in the paradigms of -yā-passives}

The general tendency to avoid long (closed) syllables before long suffix vowels may also explain some remarkable gaps in the paradigms of the \textit{-yā-passives in


\textsuperscript{58} See BISWAS 1968: 171.

\textsuperscript{59} See BISWAS 1968: 74.
the early Vedic period (noticed, for instance, by ArnoLD 1897: 317). Jamison (1984) and Hock (1985-86); for a detailed discussion, see KuliKov 2001: 552ff). While present indicative forms properly speaking (i.e., forms with primary endings) are well-attested from the RV onwards, we find in early Vedic only one subjunctive form (RV 5.31.12 -bhrīyātē; see Renou 1937: 7; no subjunctives in the AV) and no optatives at all (among the earliest attestations of the passive optatives are visrjeta and -bhriyeta in the young mantra RVKh. 5.7.3a-YV60). The defective inventory of the -yā-passives in early Vedic can hardly be explained by semantic reasons. Rather, it betrays particular morphophonological constraints. Since the stems of -yā-presents were not subject to Severs' law (i.e., could not be distracted in **CVC3a-),62 forms with long suffix vowels were avoided. Bearing in mind that the suffix vowel is long throughout the whole paradigm of subjunctives and optatives, this morphophonological constraint could be reinterpreted as a paradigmatic (grammatical) one. Only in the later period (Vedic prose), due to the growing productivity of -yā-passives and to the accompanying paradigmatic pressure, have subjunctives and optatives been added to the paradigm;62 but even at that period the aforementioned prosodic tendency triggers the irregular subjunctives discussed in Section 4.1.2-3.

5. Related phenomena in Vedic and Indo-European

5.1. Length vacillation in compounds

The correlation between the length of the root and suffix vowels, particularly, in the phonological context -īyV-, is not an isolated phenomenon in Sanskrit. A similar tendency may account for the secondary changes of the vowel length in compounds, noticed by E. Leumann more than 100 years ago (1896). Leumann has drawn attention to the fact that the final vowels of the first element of some compounds can be shortened before consonant clusters and/or before long vowels, cf. prāṇi-vairā RV. senānigraṁyā śīs, ārṇa-vābhi RV (but ārṇā MS), etc. See also Wackernagel 1889, Wackernagel 1905 [AIÜ 211]: 134f., §56e; Bloomfield & Edgerton 1932 [Ved. Var. 2]: 252ff. For a detailed discussion of the length vacillation in compounds in Vedic prose (particularly, in the Kāṭhaka), see Oberlies 1990: 149-153 and 162f.; as Oberlies (1990: 162, note 17) points out, here may also belong the cases of the secondary shortening of the stem vowel before the dual ending -bhūm, as in KS hanu-

60 Note, incidentally, that two of these infrequent forms outside the present tense paradigm properly speaking, i.e. -bhrīyāte and -bhriyeta, are built on the stem -bhrīya-, which, unlike most other -yā-stems, exhibits a short root syllable.

61 A priori, one might assume the rarity of passive imperatives – which is indeed the case – on the assumption that one cannot "order someone to do something that is by nature automatic, neither requiring nor allowing intentions or effort" (Jamison 1989: 62). This constraint does not hold, however, for other non-indicative moods.


63 Since subjunctives and optatives are lacking only for -yā-passives, but do occur in the system of the -ya-presents with root accentuation (class IV, cf. patyeta RV 10.117.5, prāti patyāsai AV 3.4.3, manyeṣṭām RV 3.58.4, 8.26.5, manyāt RV 10.27.11, yādhyai RV 4.18.2, rṣyāt RV 10.97.11, etc.), one may assume that the place of the accent could also be a relevant feature.
bhyām (~ TS hānti-bhyām), KS śroni-bhyām (~ TS śroni-bhyām); see also WACKERNAGEL 1930 [AIG III]: 54f., §21bf.

5.2. Lengthenings before short syllables

On the other hand, there is also some evidence for a “twin” tendency, i.e. the lengthening of short vowels before single consonants and short vowels, foremost in certain phonological contexts. In Section 1.2.1 I briefly discussed the secondary lengthening of ἵ in the -ya-stems built on C1 roots (hrīyānā-, for hṛiyāmā-, etc.). The generalization of this tendency (probably operating together with some other mechanisms) may account for the obligatory lengthening of ἵ and ὑ before the present suffix -ya- (in passives and denominatives).64 The same tendency may be responsible for the vowel length in the reduplication syllable of the causative aorist of the type aṭṭanat (iṭṭat-, hābuṣṭha-, etc.) and for the shortening of the originally long root vowel, as in artradāma (넷다), avivaṣat (넷다), in accordance with the trochaic pattern - ὑ; see, for instance, WHITNEY 1889: 309f.; WACKERNAGEL 1889: 18 [= Kl. Schr. II, 914]; M. LEUMANN 1962. The same explanation may hold true for some perfect forms (cf. piṭṭivāṃs-, tāṭṭānā/- tāṭṭānā, dāṣṭṣa/- dāṣṭṣa, impv. didihi / didihī etc.

Another phonological context which seems to be rather sensitive to this tendency is the open syllable before ἵ (and probably also ἴ). Here, again, we arrive at the trochaic pattern, cf. aor.part. riṣant- (attested also with the short root vowel: riṣant-) ~ pres. riṣya-; caus. diṣṭya- ~ pres. dhuṣya-; snihān- ‘snow’ ~ snihya-: ‘stick, be sticky’ (HOFFMANN 1965: 21ff. [= Außs. 2, 451ff.], etc.; see also WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AIG I]: 92ff.; KUIPER 1934: 224, fn. 4; RENOU 1952: 43; KULIKOV 1999: 232, fn. 14 (with bibl.).

5.3. Parallel phenomena in Ancient Greek

To conclude the discussion of the evidence from Indo-European, one should mention similar phenomena attested in Ancient Greek – as it seems, at a much larger scale than in Vedic. Already F. de SAUSSURE (1884) formulated a “loi rhymique de la langue grecque”, according to which, originally, Greek could not have sequences of three short syllables. This law accounts, in particular, for the rise of such forms as ἴστης ← ἴστης, ἴστης ← ἴστης, ἴστης ← ἴστης for a detailed discussion, see WACKERNAGEL 1889.

---

64 Of particular significance is the evidence furnished by the denominatives built on the a-stems. As INSLER (1997) has demonstrated, the stem vowel is lengthened after a short syllable (cf. oghya-~), but remains short after a long syllable (oṣvya~).
6. Chronological remarks

The fact that we meet instances of the shortening (lightening) of the root syllable before long suffix vowels both in the oldest Vedic texts (RV and AV) and in the late Vedic and post-Vedic period (Sūtras, Epic Sanskrit) immediately poses the problem of the chronology of the phonological processes in question. As it seems, we are confronted with a rather weak but quite stable tendency, which has survived up to the very end of the Old Indo-Aryan period. The cases of the lightening of the root syllable in the Sūtras and post-Vedic texts, as in -aset, even plead for the existence of a similar tendency in Middle Indo-Aryan (at least in some dialects), when the redaction of the relevant texts was completed (see, in particular, Chl. Werba apud Oberlies 1990: 163, note 29).

Closely related to the chronological issue is yet another question: is the length vacillation dependent on the character of the text or not? It is often assumed that the length vacillation is limited to the metrical texts and does not represent any linguistic reality of the contemporary living language (see e.g. Wackernagel 1889: 20 [= Kl. Schr. Ill. 916]). This holds true, indeed, for several phenomena typical for Vedic hymns, such as lengthening in auslaut (yātrā, kṛṣṇā, etc.) or length vacillation in forms like dādiḥ/dādiḥi. Yet, the rich collection of examples from Vedic prose (cf. śrīyā- / śrīyē-, yaṁyā- / yaṁyē-, asya- / ase-, etc.) shows that this tendency, albeit widely used for metrical purposes, holds for non-metrical texts, too.

7. Typological parallels

All the correlations discussed above can be put in a broader perspective, as a consequence of the general tendency to reach a certain balance of syllable length within word boundaries and, in particular, to avoid the accumulation of long vowels and/or heavy syllables. In general, such a tendency should not be regarded as limited to the poetic texts and appears quite natural from the prosodic point of view.

7.1. The Balto-Fennic-Saami consonant gradation

In my view, a typological parallel with this phenomenon (albeit incomplete in some respects) is the Balto-Fennic-Saami consonant gradation, or, to be more precise, some of the paradigmatic alternations which belong here. A few examples relevant for our discussion are given in (6):

(6) Finnish nom.sg. tyttö – nom.pl. tytöt ‘girl’;
    Finnish nom.sg. kukka – gen.sg. kukan, elative sg. kukkan ‘flower’;
    Saami nom.sg. namma – elative sg. nammast ‘name’;
    Finnish nom.sg. jalka – gen.sg. jalan, elative sg. jalanast ‘leg’

(for further examples and detailed discussion, see Gordon 1997).
I am not going to discuss the various diachronic explanations of this phenomenon (see Gordon, op.cit.). Here I will only draw attention to the fact that at least one of the possible synchronic interpretations of the alternations above \( t → t, kk → k, mm → m, ll → l \) can be formulated as parallel to that suggested for the secondary shortenings and lengthenings in Vedic. Specifically, on the assumption that closed syllables are heavier than open ones, the consonant gradation as in (6) can be regarded as resulting from the phonological process which makes the penultimate syllable open (= less heavy) if the last syllable becomes closed (= heavier), in accordance with the pattern Closed + Open / Open + Closed: tyt.tō → ty.tō, kūk.kā → kū.kān, nəm.ma → nə.məst, jəl.kə → jə.lən.

7.2. Iambic lengthening

Another phenomenon which is concerned with the vowel length balance within a word is the ‘iambic lengthening’, attested, in particular, in a number of Amerindian languages (see Hayes 1995: 205f. for examples and discussion). Together with some other parameters, such as stress and position in word, the metrical scheme of a word determines changes in vowel length. For instance, the even-numbered light (= short open) syllables become heavy in sequences such as \( -v̂ -v̂ -v̂ \) (cf. Hixkaryana ówto-hōna ‘to the village’), \( -v̂ -v̂ -v̂ -v̂ -v̂ \) (cf. Hixkaryana tōhkar’e-hōna-hāsaka ‘finally to Tohkury’), \( -v̂ -v̂ -v̂ \) (cf. Choktaw pisali ‘pisazli’ ‘I see’), \( -v̂ -v̂ -v̂ -v̂ -v̂ \) (cf. Choktaw cihabinači ‘čihabinači’ ‘I give you a present’). Note that the vowel lengthening in Hixkaryana does not depend on the stress in dissyllabic words consisting of two short syllables (CVVC), cf. kwaya ‘kwaya ‘red and green macaw’; tun ‘tun ‘water’. This lengthening does not operate in (C)VCCV words (i.e. in the closed syllable), such as arko ‘take it’.

7.3. Phonological patterning in Yidin

Finally, the most striking parallel with the Vedic phenomena discussed above occurs in the Australian aboriginal language Yidin. In accordance with the permitted phonological patterning described by Dixon (1977: 40-42), two long vowels must be separated by a short syllable, as e.g. in mag:riŋg:ɪa:ldaj:n ‘climb up-ASPECT-COMIT-COMING-DAT-SUBORD’, burvā:ling:ɪn ‘jump-GOING-COMIT-PURP’. In the cases where this constraint is violated, i.e. two long vowels appear one after another, one of them is obligatorily shortened, as, for instance, in bargandaqːn ‘bargandaqːn ‘pass by’); see Dixon 1977: 74-76.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀgniGS</td>
<td>Āgni-va ṣya-Grhya-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpDhs</td>
<td>Āpastaṁba-Dharma-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āprāyaśe.</td>
<td>Āprāyaśe-Siṣṭṭhāṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpŚŚ</td>
<td>Āpastaṁba-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀśiGS</td>
<td>Āśvalāyaṇa-Grhya-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀśŚŚ</td>
<td>Āpastaṁba-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀṇŚŚ</td>
<td>Āṇandāśrama-Saṁskṛta-Granthā-valīḥ (Āṇandāśrama Saṁskṛta Series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Atharvaveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP</td>
<td>AV, Paippalāda recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVParī.</td>
<td>The Parisiṣṭas of the AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVŚ</td>
<td>AV, Saunakīya recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhGS</td>
<td>Baudhāyana-Grhya-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhPS</td>
<td>Baudhāyana-Piṭṭhmedha-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhŚŚ</td>
<td>Baudhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhāgP</td>
<td>Bhāgavata-Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhārGS</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja-Grhya-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhārŚŚ</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br.</td>
<td>Brāhmaṇas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChU</td>
<td>Chāndogya-Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DevatāḥB</td>
<td>Devatāḥyāya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DrāhyGS</td>
<td>Drāhyāyana-Grhya-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DrāhyŚŚ</td>
<td>Drāhyāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.</td>
<td>Epic Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HirDhs</td>
<td>Hiranya-kesi-Dharma-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HirŚŚ</td>
<td>Hiranya-kesi-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JŚŚ</td>
<td>Jaiminiya-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KaivalyaU</td>
<td>Kaivalya-Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kash.</td>
<td>Kashmiri ms. (of AVP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KathA</td>
<td>Katha-Āranyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kath-Saṃk.</td>
<td>Katha-Samkalana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KātyŚ</td>
<td>Kātyāyana-Śrāutra-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KauŚGS</td>
<td>Kauśīkā-Grhya-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KauŚ</td>
<td>Kauśika-Śūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>Kauśitaki-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KpŚ</td>
<td>Kapiṇḍhala-Kaṇha-Samhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Kaṭhaka-(Saṁhitā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LāṭyŚŚ</td>
<td>Lāṭyāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MānŚŚ</td>
<td>Mānava-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManuSmṛ.</td>
<td>Manu-Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbh.</td>
<td>Mahā-Bhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaitriU</td>
<td>Maitri (Maitri), Maitrāyana, Maitrāyaṇyā Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Maitrāyaṇi Saṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NidānaS</td>
<td>Nidāna-Śūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or.</td>
<td>Orissa mss. (of AVP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParāŚŚmṛ.</td>
<td>Parāśara-Smṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pā.</td>
<td>Pāṇini (Aṣṭādhyāyī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Paṇcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pp.</td>
<td>Padapāṭha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Rgveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVKh.</td>
<td>Rgveda-Khitāṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚB(M)</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina recension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚBK</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Kāṇva recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚGS</td>
<td>Sākhyāyana-Grhya-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚŚŚ</td>
<td>Sākhyāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚrŚū.</td>
<td>Śrauta-Sūtras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sū.</td>
<td>Śūtras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Sāmaveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVB</td>
<td>Sāma-viṣṭhāna-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td>Taṇṭiriṇya-Aranyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Taṇṭiriṇya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Taṇṭiriṇya-Saṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up.</td>
<td>Upaniṣads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VādhS</td>
<td>Vādhiśa-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VaiśhGS</td>
<td>Vaikhānasa-Grhya-Sūtra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VaikhŚŚ  Vaikhānasa-Śrauta-Sūtra
VaitŚ  Vaitāna-Sūtra
VārŚŚ  Vārāha-Śrauta-Sūtra
VāsDhŚ  Vāsiṣṭha-Dharma-Sūtra
ViṣṇuSmṛ  Viṣṇu-Smṛti
VS  Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā
YājŚmṛ  Yājñavalkya-Smṛti
YV  Yajurveda(-Saṃhitā)
(= VS, MS, KS, KPŚ, TS)
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